DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 487 UD 017 151

AUTHOR Ellis, Ronald S.
TITLE Student-Parent Activities Center, June 1976.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 39p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63434

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attendance; Discipline Problems; Elementary Education; *Grade 5; *Grade 6; Mathematics Instruction; Parent Conferences; Parent Influence; *Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; School Community Programs; *School Social Workers; Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS New York (Bronx); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the Student Parent Activities Center, a program designed to involve parents in the educational process of their children, improve parental knowledge and participation in the school, and improve parental influence on student attendance. One hundred fifty students and 50 parents participated in the program. The parent participants all had children in the fifth through eighth grades who were truant or whose attendance records were poor. However, those students who participated in the program were in the fifth or sixth grades. The parent participants were organized into two groups composed of up to twenty participants each. The groups met once a week and discussed mathematics, reading, and school attendance requirements. The program was administered by a coordinator, school and neighborhood workers, and family workers. To determine the effectiveness of the program, questionnaires were completed by parents, and evaluators observed the program in operation on four separate occasions. The evaluation concluded that parents were made aware of pupil academic and discipline requirements of the school; however, the program was not effective in helping parents help their children with reading and mathematics, or in improving student attendance. The appendix includes the observation reports. (JP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141487

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 20-63434

STUDENT-PARENT ACTIVITIES CENTER

June 1976

Prepared by

Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

CG 11151

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Program	1
II.	Evaluative Procedures	4
III.	Findings	7
IV.	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	16
Appendix		
A.	Observation Reports	19
B.	Questionnaire to Measure Parents' Familiarity with Pupil Academic, Attendance and Discipline Requirements	32
C.	Questionnaire to Measure the Parents' Ability to Assist Their Children in the Acquisition of Basic Reading Skills	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Summary of Results Based upon Participant Responses to the Pre-Post Administration of Part I of a Locally Developed Questionnaire for Evaluation Objective 1	8
2.	Summary of Results Based upon Participant Responses to the Pre-Post Administration of Part II of a Locally Developed Questionnaire for Evaluation Objective 1	8
3.	Ratio of Attendance to Register for 1975-1976	11
4.	Ratio of Attendance to Register for Pupils in Attendance in the Target Population	11
5.	Comparison of Total School Attendance Ratio with That of the Target Population (Grades 5 and 6) for 1974-1975 .	12
6.	Comparison of Total School Attendance Ratios for Selected Periods in 1974-1975 with the Same Periods in 1975-1976 .	12

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

The Student-Parent Activities Center served approximately 50 adults and 150 children selected from the population residing in the area serviced by IS 52, Bronx. The parent participants all had children in the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth grades of the school who were truant or whose attendance records were poor. The children services by the program were pupils in the fifth or sixth grade of the school. Parent participants who were selected all volunteered to participate in the program.

As a result of participation in the program it was believed that parents would attain familiarity with pupil requirements for attendance, discipline and academic subjects such as reading and mathematics. As a result of participation in the program, parents should have been able to assist their children in acquiring the basic skills of reading and mathematics. They should also have been able to select appropriate books and other materials in those subject areas for that purpose. Furthermore, it was believed that the attendance of pupils serviced by the program would improve. The program was designed to involve parents more fully in the educational process at IS 52, Bronx, by improving parental knowledge and participation in the school and by working to improve pupil attendance.

To accomplish these results, parent participants were organized into two groups, each group having, on the average, at least 20 participants. The groups were scheduled to meet at formal sessions on Thursdays in two sections. One section was scheduled to meet from 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM and the other section was scheduled to meet from 10:30 AM to 12:00 noon.

The agenda of these sessions addressed topics such as mathematics requirements, reading requirements and attendance requirements.

The program staff contacted the pupil participants by visiting their homes or as a result of referrals made by the professional staff. Pupils did not actually participate in the scheduled sessions. Pupil participation in the program was limited to the contact made with the home by the program staff and to the servicing of pupil needs as a result of professional staff referrals. In addition, there were parents contacted through the program staff in the field and given the information provided in the formal scheduled session, who actually never attended the sessions held at the school.

Within the total program, New York City Umbrella Program funds were used specifically for one coordinator, one school neighborhood worker, one junior school neighborhood worker, and three family workers. The specific activities engaged in by these persons will now be described.

Activities of the Staff Funded by School-Community Interaction Umbrella Program Funds

Program Coordinator. The program coordinator assisted in selection and placement of program personnel; supervised all program staff; cooperated with program personnel in planning and formative evaluation; processed payrolls; kept all data for Central Board of Education, "Umbrella Office"; served as liaison between the program and the Central Board of Education "Umbrella Office" and the program and the school principal.

School Neighborhood Worker. The school neighborhood worker supervised and served as resource person for Family Workers and Junior Neighborhood

Worker; prepared agenda; implemented and contacted resource personnel for the scheduled Thursday sessions with parents; counselled parents individually; maintained liaison between supervised program staff and program coordinator; serviced children referred to program by professional staff; served as translator at meetings, interviews and conferences; coordinated daily check of class attendance records; accompanied parents on "fact-finding" trips; attended all curriculum training sessions in reading and mathematics.

Junior Neighborhood Worker. The junior neighborhood worker assisted the school neighborhood worker in all duties.

Family Workers (3). The family workers recruited parents for the program; formed parents into groups for workshops; provided individual counselling to parents; visited parents, hospitals and other sites; attended all coordinator training sessions; maintained and submitted daily log to coordinator; provided individual help to children referred to them by professional staff; accompanied parents to social service offices for official business; reviewed daily attendance records and contacted parents via telephone, home visits or mail where appropriate; accompanied parents on "fact-finding" trips and Community School Board meetings and translated proceedings where necessary; attended all curriculum training sessions in reading and mathematics.

Although the project proposal states that the program was supposed to begin January 1, 1976 and continue until June 30, 1976, the program did not begin until March 29, 1976. The program was in operation for a total of 94 calendar days.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

On-site visits were made by the program evaluator and interviews were held on site with the program coordinator, the School Neighborhood Workers, and the Family Workers. In addition, conferences were held with Central Board of Education School-Community Interaction Umbrella Program personnel.

To determine the effectiveness with which the evaluation objectives were attained with the total population of 200, the evaluator observed the program in operation on four separate occasions (April 6, 8, 29 and May 6, 1976). Observation reports are appended (see Appendix A).

The objectives of the evaluation are:

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions improves on items related to pupil academic, attendance, and discipline requirements as measured by a staff-developed criterion referenced instrument.

For the determination of evaluation objective 1, questionnaires were employed (a sample instrument is included in Appendix B). The instruments measure parents' familiarity with pupil academic, attendance and discipline requirements. The instruments were developed by the program staff. The instruments were validated by the staff with respect to the items incorporated within them. The instrument was administered to the parents at the beginning of the session during which the topic covered in the questionnaire is discussed as a pretest and again toward the end of the program as a posttest.

Evaluation Objective 2: To determine if the performance of parents

participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program improves on items related to assisting their children in the acquisition of the basic reading skills and selecting relevant books and other helpful materials as measured by a staff developed criterion referenced instrument.

For the determination of evaluation objective 2, a questionnaire was employed (a sample instrument is included in Appendix C). The instrument measures the parents' ability to assist their children in the acquisition of basic reading skills and to select relevant books and other helpful materials. The instrument was developed by the program staff. The instrument was validated by the staff with respect to the items incorporated within it. The instrument was administered to the parents at the beginning of the session during which the topic covered by the questionnaire is discussed as a pretest and was to be administered again toward the end of the program as a posttest.

The posttest for evaluation objective 2 was not carried out. Late funding and the resultant late start did not allow sufficient time for the program to be fully implemented. The program did not get underway until March 29, 1976. This was just enough time to enable the program director and staff to run a pilot program from which they could use the data gathered to anticipate the problems that could be expected during the fully implemented program in the 1976-1977 academic year.

Evaluation Objective 3: To determine if the attendance of pupil participants in the program improves as measured by the comparison of the appropriate monthly attendance records of this year with those of the previous year.

For the determination of evaluation objective 3, available attendance records of the fifth and sixth grades for the period from mid-March to early May 1976 were compared with the records of the same grades for the same period during the 1975 spring term. The attendance data were gathered in early May.

Evaluation Objective 4: To determine the extent to which the program as actually implemented coincides with the program as described and any subsequent modifications or addenda.

For the determination of evaluation objective 4, the evaluator-consultant made judgments based upon the on-site visits and conferences held with the program staff and others associated with the program.

Although the evaluation design specifies that between January 1, 1976 and June 30, 1976 60 adults and 200 children would participate in the program, only approximately 200 subjects (i.e., 50 adults and 150 children) were involved by the time that the program got underway on March 29, 1976.

It is important to note here that there are a number of limitations that have been imposed upon the evaluation procedure. The program was not given notice of its funding until March 23, 1976. As of April 1, 1976 only four of the six program staff funded by the Central Board's "Umbrella Office" were processed and working in the program.

In spite of the hardship imposed upon the program, the program director was able to implement whatever aspects of the program it was feasible to implement.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

Evaluation Objective 1

To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions improves on items related to pupil academic, attendance and discipline requirements as measured by a staff developed criterion referenced instrument.

The performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions did improve on items related to pupil academic, attendance and discipline requirements. The evaluation objective 1 can therefore be held to have been attained. Table 1 shows the results of the pre-post administration of Part I of the locally developed questionnaire (see Appendix B). A comparison of the percent of correct responses on the pretest with the percent of correct responses on the posttest yields a difference of 38%. Parent participants completed 38% more responses correctly on the Part I posttest than they did on the Part I (fill-in or completion) pretest.

Table 2 shows the results of the pre-post administration of Part II (true-false) of the questionnaire for determination of evaluation objective 1. A comparison of the percent of correct responses between the pre- and post-administrations of Part II of the questionnaire yield a percentage difference of 27%.

The percentage differences demonstrated by the parents on Parts I and II of the questionnaire for Evaluation Objective 1 indicate that there was improvement and that parents did learn about pupil academic, attendance and discipline requirements in IS 52, Bronx.

Table 1

Summary of Results Based upon Participant[a] Responses to the Pre-Post Administration of Part I of a Locally Developed Questionnaire for Evaluation Objective 1 (Pretest 4/6/76; Posttest 5/4/76)

Responses	Pretest	Posttest
Number correct	462	810
Number incorrect	463	113
Total	925	923
Percent correct	50	88

[a]Based upon 37 completed questionnaires.

Table 2

Summary of Results Based upon Participant[a] Responses to the Pre-Post Administration of Part II of a Locally Developed Questionnaire for Evaluation Objective 1 (Pretest 4/6/76; Posttest 5/4/76)

Responses	Pretest	Posttest
Number correct	265	365
Number incorrect	105	5
Total	370	370
Percent correct	72	99

[a]Based upon 37 completed questionnaires.

Evaluation Objective 2

To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program improves on items related to assisting their children in the acquisition of the basic reading skills and selecting relevant tasks and other helpful materials as measured by a staff developed criterion referenced instrument.

Although a questionnaire was developed and utilized by the program staff (see Appendix C) it was only administered to the parent participants once. The intent was to utilize the information obtained to anticipate problems that could be expected during the program's implementation next year (1976-1977).

The on-site observation report for April 8, 1976 (see Appendix A) indicates that parents responded positively to a presentation in Spanish and English concerning the techniques for assisting their children in the acquisition of basic reading skills and selecting relevant books and other helpful materials. This session was presented by the supervisor in charge of Language Arts and Reading, the Principal, who served as interpreter, and the program staff. The report clearly indicated that the staff was making every effort to adapt the program to the needs of the parent participants.

Although the evaluation objective 2 cannot be held to have been attained, it is the opinion of the evaluator that extenuating circumstances such as late funding and late implementation precluded its attainment. Furthermore, it should be noted that, in the time available, the program staff was able to gain a great deal of information to enable them to

refine the program's implementation for next year (1976-1977).

Evaluation Objective 3

To determine if the attendance of pupil participants in the program improves as measured by the comparison of the appropriate monthly attendance records of this year with those of the previous year.

Tables 3, 4, and 5 show the results of the analysis of the data available as of early May in regard to attendance. Although the records for last year's fifth and sixth grades were not available, the tables indicate that during the period in which the program was in operation attendance was stabilized at slightly above 80% for the total school. Table 4 shows in greater detail the attendance ratio of pupils in the target population. Table 5 shows how the target population attendance ratio compared with that of the total school for the 1974-1975 school year.

Unfortunately, since attendance records for March and April of 1975 were not available, comparisons between the period of program implementation this year and last year could not be made. It is therefore not possible to fairly judge the impact of this year's program upon the attendance of the target population.

Additional information was obtained regarding evaluation objective 3 by making a comparison between the available attendance ratios of the total school for this year and last year. The evaluation report by Professor Sheldon Kastner and Professor Paul Heintz of New York University (FunctionNumber 20-53434) indicates that the program was in operation from October 1974 to June 1975. Table 6 indicates that during the periods

Table 3

Ratio of Attendance to Register for 1975-1976

Month	Ratio (%)
September	
October	82
November	82
December	79
January	78
February	80
March	82[a]
April	81[a]

[a]Program in operation

Table 4

Ratio of Attendance to Register for Pupils in Attendance in the Target Population

Attendance Periods[a]	Attendance (%)	
	Grade 5 Register 132	Grade 6 Register 280
March 23-31, 1976	89.3	77.1
April 1-30, 1976	86.1	74.3
May 5-7, 1976	87.0	74.4

[a]The program began operation on March 29, 1976. The attendance data were collected on May 7, 1976.

Table 5

Comparison of Total School Attendance Ratio with That of the Target Population (Grades 5 and 6) for 1974-1975

Period Ending	1 9/30	2 10/31	3 11/30	4 12/31	5 1/31	6 2/28	7 3/31	8 4/30	9 5/31	10 6/30
Grade 5	86	86	81	86	85	86			85	89
Grade 6	83	83	84	83	81	82			82	83
Total school	80	84	83	83	81	82			82	82

Table 6

Comparison of Total School Attendance Ratios for Selected Periods in 1974-1975 with the Same Periods in 1975-1976

	Period				
	2	3	4	5	6
Total ratio 1974-1975	84	83	83	81	82
Total ratio 1975-1976	82	82	79	78	80

of 1974-1975 in which the program was operational the attendance ratios compared favorably with the same periods in 1975-1976 when the program was not operational.

Evaluation Objective 4

To determine the extent to which the program as actually implemented coincides with the program as described and any subsequent modifications or addenda.

There is no question about the fact that the Student-Parent Activities Center is attempting to service the needs of the participants. The program staff and the professional staff of the school cooperate willingly and effectively to meet the goals of the program. The administrative and moral support provided to the program by the school principal sets the tone for the cooperation. As a result, parents and children benefit greatly from the atmosphere of warmth and cooperation that permeates the informal portions of the scheduled Thursday sessions.

The facilities provided are quite adequate for the needs of the program. The rooms used for the sessions were generally large enough to accommodate the groups which met in them without diminishing the atmosphere of candor.

In spite of the efforts of the program staff there are a number of discrepancies attributable to the late funding which this evaluator noted. It is important to state that the program was requested and planned on the basis of six months time for implementation. The program, however, existed for only 94 days (March 29, 1976 to June 30, 1976). As of March 30, 1976, only three of the five program personnel (exclusive

of the program director) were processed and working. This had an effect, therefore, upon the number of participants who could be recruited into and serviced by the program. Hence, the number services was somewhat less than proposed. The shortened duration of the implemented program also had an effect upon the amount of "instruction" that parents were able to receive. This precluded the possibility of producing measurable gains in knowledge concerning the school's reading curriculum. Furthermore, it is believed this also reduced the impact that the program staff in the field and the impact that the scheduled session had upon the attendance ratio of the target population.

The proposed two scheduled sections of Thursday morning sessions proved to be difficult for parents to cope with. Fortunately, the program staff was sensitive to the parents' needs and flexible enough to transform the two sessions into one larger session which ran from approximately 9:30 A.M. until 11:15 A.M.

With the exception of the above stated discrepancies, this evaluator found that the program as implemented coincided with the program described in the proposal. The activities of the staff demonstrate active commitment to the accomplishment of program goals and objectives.

Recommendations made by the evaluator of the 1974-1975 academic year program (Function number 20-53434) were as follows:

1. Based on the favorable impressions from site visits and partial data submitted, the program should be recycled.
2. A workshop on instrument development should be conducted at the beginning of the project year.

The program was recycled, but only for 94 days, and it was funded

late. As a result of this shortened time a workshop on instrument development could not be feasibly done.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Student-Parent Activities Center has not met its second objective of helping parents to assist their children in Reading, or its third objective of improving the attendance ratios in IS 52. During the period of implementation, there were some discrepancies between the program as it was implemented and the program as described in the project proposal. Late funding was the major factor in diminished recruitment, shortened duration of implementation, and reduced impact upon attendance.

The program did, however, meet its first objective to make parents aware of the pupil academic and discipline requirements of the school. Furthermore, with the exception of the above stated discrepancies, the fourth objective to implement the program in the manner described in the project proposal was attained. The program staff serviced the needs of the participants and demonstrated effective cooperation toward meeting the program goals. Program staff efforts coincided with the program staff activities described in the project proposal.

This evaluator concludes that, even though only two of the evaluation objectives have been obtained, the program has certainly been worthwhile. Parents seemed interested and appreciative of the opportunity to investigate the school's curriculum in greater detail. The staff worked diligently to adapt the program to the needs of the participants. All written material was provided in English and Spanish. All sessions were conducted either in English with Spanish translation or in Spanish with English translation.

In addition to the specific recommendations to follow, this evaluator

recommends that the program be continued.

1. Since the attendance was poor at the beginning of the program's implementation more elaborate efforts should be made at recruiting a larger number of parents.

2. In order to reach a larger number of parents the number of family workers should be increased and/or cassette recorders and tapes of the weekly sessions should be made available to parents unable to attend.

3. The value of the program to the school seems quite clear even on the basis of its attainment of objective 1 to make parents aware of the pupil academic and discipline requirements of the school. The program should be expanded to include the entire school population.

4. Some indication of the program's approval should be secured in advance in order to enable staff to plan informally beforehand. Publicity about the program and efforts at recruitment should be mounted prior to the program's starting date. Furthermore, recruitment efforts should be across the widest possible range so that more parents who speak only English can become participants.

5. The number of sessions per week should be limited to only one and scheduled at a time more practical for parents with small children at home to attend.

6. Because of the initial reluctance of some parents to participate in the discussion or ask questions during the formal presentation at the Thursday sessions, it is recommended that some of the sessions be devoted to the techniques of communication in groups. The group might discuss

topics such as "How to Ask Questions," etc.

7. Evening meetings might be occasionally held (perhaps once per month) to enable working interested parents to attend.

8. The working hours of the program staff might be adjusted to extend beyond the school day to enable the program to service the participants more efficiently.

Appendix A: OBSERVATION REPORTS

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: April 6, 1976 School: IS 52, Bronx

Project title: Student-Parent Activities Center, BE 20-63434

Class: Library Room: 300 From 9 AM to 12 noon

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Benjamin Ramos, Assistant Principal

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

Parents were given questionnaire to complete. The content of the questionnaire was the basis for the discussion that occurred throughout the session. The questionnaire asked about attendance, discipline, and academic requirements of the school.

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

As the session progressed, the parents asked questions and made comments related to the topic of the questionnaire.

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

Most parents attempted to complete the questionnaires. Some were reluctant to attempt to complete them, fearing that they could not answer correctly. Anxiety was relieved when they were told that it was not necessary for them to complete all questions.

Method of Instruction used:

Lecture-discussion. Mr. Ramos told parents present that their efforts would to a large degree determine the success of the program that would be recycled in September 1976.

Description of Materials Used by Staff:

Questionnaires in Spanish or English and pencils were distributed to the parents by the staff.

Number of staff in room: Five

Describe auxiliary personnel activity:

The staff, including Mr. Ramos, circulated about the room in order to encourage the parents to complete their questionnaires.

What was teacher's major role?

Mr. Ramos spoke to the parents and discussed each of the items on the questionnaire in turn in terms of its significance to the child and the parent.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.):

Twelve parents (12).

Is the program operational? Yes

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

The program coordinator and staff are making attempts at beginning the project. Funding was received only recently (due January 1, 1976). Approval has not been obtained for the Junior Neighborhood Worker, Mrs. Rivera.

Identify:

Strengths--Parents in attendance were in agreement and seemed to express interest and concern regarding the objectives as implied by the discussion of the questionnaires.

Weaknesses--Program was funded late. The staff was not given ample opportunity to plan. The initial response was small. Although only 78%

of the school population was Spanish speaking, no English speaking only parents were present.

Recommendations:

Some indication of program approval should be secured in advance to enable staff to plan informally beforehand. Moreover, publicity about the program and efforts at recruitment should be mounted prior to the program's starting date. Recruitment should be across the widest range possible so that English speaking only parents may be included.

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: April 8, 1976 School IS 52, Bronx

Project title: Student-Parent Activities Center, BE 20-63434

Room: 127 From: 9 AM to noon

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Benjamin Ramos, Assistant Principal

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

Mr. Ramos discussed briefly the importance of the previous questionnaire items. He stressed the importance of certain basic bits of information such as the telephone number of the school. The principal, Mr. Gallego, introduced the Assistant Principal in Charge of Language Arts and Reading, Mr. Comerano. The session activity was related to what can be done by parents to improve their child's reading.

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

Parents listened attentively and asked questions where appropriate. Some parents even took notes on separate sheets of paper which they had brought with them.

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

Parents spoke animatedly about what they had observed and learned in the session during the coffee break afterwards.

Method of instruction used:

The Program Coordinator, School Principal, Supervisor in Charge of Language Arts and Reading and the Senior Neighborhood Worker each took a turn at lecturing and/or interpreting the presentation into English or Spanish.

Description of materials used by staff:

A handout was distributed. It summarized in outline form the content of the session. An additional handout containing the Basic Sight Vocabulary of 220 words was also distributed.

Description of materials used by pupils:

Parents reviewed the questionnaire which had been completed on April 6, 1976. At that point they were given the opportunity to write information from the questionnaire into their own notes. The staff then collected the questionnaires to keep for their own records.

Number of program staff in room:

In addition to the Senior Neighborhood Worker and the Program Coordinator there were two additional staff members of the program.

Describe auxiliary personnel activity:

Program staff either observed the session in order to bring the information to the homes of parents who were unable to attend the sessions or served as interpreter.

What was teacher's major role?

Presenter of information and leader of discussion. The main speaker, Mr. Comerano, discussed what parents could do at home to help their children improve reading.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.):

17 parents.

Is the program operational? Yes

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

Program staff is attempting to implement the sessions in accordance with the description provided in the proposal.

Identify:

Strengths--The staff adapts the program to the needs of the parents. One Family Worker assists a parent with difficulty in remembering to complete the questionnaires. This parent was also physically disabled.

Weaknesses--There are not enough parents. Even though more parents are attending, it is still not enough. The time spent by the family worker in the home is limited. A parent at home cannot receive as much information as is available in the sessions.

Recommendations:

More elaborate efforts at recruitment should be undertaken. Changes in recruitment procedure should be documented in order to ensure success in attracting more parents in subsequent cycles by simply repeating and expanding upon "successful" recruitment procedures. Increase the number of family workers in the program and/or provide cassette recorders and cassette recordings of the weekly sessions for "home-bound" parents. This would enable parents with small children at home who are unable to attend to still be kept abreast of the content of the weekly sessions.

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: April 29, 1976 School: IS 52, Bronx

Project title: Student-Parent Activities Center, BE 20-63434

Room: 127 From 9 AM to noon

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Gallego, School Principal

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

Parents were given a very brief description of the content included in the school mathematics program. Mr. Bruce Keltz, the assistant principal in charge of mathematics, described the following aspects of the program: computational skills training, problem solving skills training, geometry, units of measurement, consumer mathematics, decimal system of numeration, and the mathematics laboratory. In addition, Mr. Keltz provided answers to the following questions: How can I help my child if I don't understand it myself? How can I actually help my child to learn to use mathematics?

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

Parents attended to the discussion. Subsequent to the session parents became involved in informal discussion groups over coffee. However, only one question was asked during the question and answer period.

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

Parents attend but appear not to feel comfortable enough to inquire further. Only one parent asked a question during the question and answer session.

Method of instruction used:

Mainly lecture with a period set aside for questions. Presentation was done in English with Spanish translation. Mr. Gallego stayed on during the coffee session and talked with smaller groups.

Description of materials used by staff:

All parents received a copy of the handouts prepared for the session.

Description of materials used by pupils:

Bilingual (Spanish-English) materials were distributed to parents. The material covering the session content was printed in both languages.

Number of program and professional staff in room: 6

Describe auxiliary personnel activity:

Program staff registered the names of the attendees. They also prepared refreshments. They talked informally with parents at the conclusion of the session. Their primary goal seemed to be that of determining ways of further servicing the parents.

What was teacher's major role?

The session leader(s) Mr. Keltz and Mr. Gallego presented the information printed on the handout in greater detail. They answered the question asked at the end of the session.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.):

33 parents plus some young pre-school aged children.

Is the program operational? Yes

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

Session activities and activities of the program staff coincided with the program as described in the proposal.

Identify:

Strengths--The parents seemed interested and appreciative of the opportunity to investigate more closely the curriculum covered in the session. The number of participants has increased to an acceptable level. The program now has a full complement of staff as of Monday.

Weaknesses--Although attendance has improved, the early morning sessions are a problem for some parents. Parents attending the sessions are reluctant to ask questions.

Recommendations:

Some meetings should be held later in the day (perhaps in the evening) to enable interested but working parents to attend. Attendance at least once per month at a meeting of parents and children at a joint meeting might be helpful in terms of fostering more involvement. Perhaps some sessions devoted to some of the techniques of communication in groups might help to open up communication within the sessions. The sessions could deal with topics such as "What is the best way to ask questions and get answers?"

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: May 6, 1976 School: IS 52, Bronx

Project title: Student-Parent Activities Center, BE 20-63434

Room: 127 From 9 AM to noon

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Benjamin Ramos, Assistant Principal

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

For a description of the content of today's session refer to the attached minutes prepared by the program staff.

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

(See minutes of today's meeting.)

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

(See minutes of today's meeting.)

Method of instruction used:

(See minutes of today's meeting.)

Description of materials used by staff:

An outline of the content of the presentation in English and Spanish was distributed to the parents by the staff.

Description of materials used by pupils:

Handouts distributed by staff. Paper, notebooks and pencils.

Number of staff in room:

All program staff were present. In addition, personnel from the Central Board's "Umbrella" office and the State Department of Education were present.

What was teacher's major role?

For a description of the Coordinator of the Bilingual Complex, Mrs. Garcia's, role see the minutes of today's meeting.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.):

36 parents and some small children.

Is the program operational? Yes

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

The program is being implemented according to design.

Identify:

Strengths--Recruitment efforts were successful. Involvement of parents is increased

Recommendations:

Attempts should be made to continue efforts that have been made up to the present over into the subsequent cycle.

May 6, 1976

PARENT-STUDENT ACTIVITY CENTER

Bilingual-Bicultural Education
Speaker Mrs. O. Garcia, Coordinator, Bil. Complex

Meeting place: Room 127
Meeting time: 9 a.m.

All members of staff,
Mr. Powlis and Mr. Johnson present

I Mrs. Garcia spoke on the needs and merits of bilingual and bicultural education. She made a history of the non-English child in the New York City Public School System, tracing his adjustment or lack of it from time of arrival and until the first generation. She mentioned the following aspects in such a pupil's school life:

a. strange language
b. strange culture
c. sense of rejection by others
d. non-achievement; under-achievement
e. frustration, then open hostility
f. reaction against local culture
g. lost generation for the most part

The speaker's contention is that bilingual-bicultural education is the answer to problems posed by the social, cultural and academic alienation of the newcomer. Parent asked question--Can any child of any background be placed in the Bilingual program? Mrs. Garcia's reply was that if a parent wants her child in the program, the background has nothing to do with it.

II Mrs. Garcia made an analysis of the consequences of the "alienation" in which a newly arrived youngster finds himself, as follows:

1. Rejection of parents as representation of an outmoded, old-fashioned and excentric culture.
2. Papa and mama seen as inferior for their inability to speak English.
3. No communication with parents and adult members of family.
4. Lack of identity with either segment of population--the English speaking and the Spanish speaking.
5. Insecurity due to lack of identity.
6. Gang-type organizations offer a sense of belonging and security.
7. A complete gap between younger and older generations.

Parents asked questions, such as--If a parent cares about his child's school work, would this give him a sense of security and confidence. Mrs. Garcia's answer was that if a parent is considerate the child

may benefit, but that some parents lack the ability to orient their children properly.

III Bridging the gap--reasons for a Bilingual-Bicultural program:

1. Academic--a chance to get a solid, effective education.
2. Social--equipping the younger generation for meaningful interaction with members of family and peers of the different ethnic groups.
3. Cultural--instilling the vital pride of being Spanish, pride of his culture and pride of the culture of the adopted country.
4. Economic--preparing the youngster for the skilled labor market, college education and the opportunities that will open up at all levels of government.
5. Political--offering the know-how, the sophistication needed for political involvement.

Parent asked--If a child graduates from the Bilingual Program in the school, will he continue in such a program in high school? Mrs. Garcia answered that nowadays there are such programs at all levels of the educational ladder, even in college. If he chose to be in such a program he could.

A general discussion took place now, with the parent participants breaking up into small groups to talk with different members of the staff.

Mr. Johnson, an educator from Albany, and Mr. Powlis, from the Umbrella office, were in attendance at this meeting. Mr. Johnson had a few remarks for the participants.

At 11 the meeting was adjourned and refreshments were served.

Appendix B: QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE PARENTS' FAMILIARITY WITH PUPIL ACADEMIC, ATTENDANCE AND DISCIPLINE REQUIREMENTS

Part I: Fill in

1. The school's address is _____.
2. The school's telephone number is _____.
3. The school goes from grade _____ to grade _____.
4. This school is in district _____.
5. There are approximately _____ students in this school.
6. The principal of the school is _____.
7. There are _____ assistant principals in our school.
8. The assistant principal of your child's grade is _____.
9. Your child's official class is _____.
10. Your child's official room is _____ on the _____ floor.
11. Your child's official teacher is _____.
12. The guidance counselor of your child is _____.
13. The school begins at _____ A.M. and ends at _____ P.M.
14. A pupil is late if he comes after _____.
15. If a child is absent from school one or two days, the parent must send a _____ the following day.
16. If a pupil is absent three or more days the child must bring a _____.
17. Attendance to school is _____ according to the Education Law of the State of New York.
18. If a child stays out of school without a legal reason he is a _____.
19. The Board of Education will send a _____ to visit the pupil's home.
20. If a child still does not come to school, the attendance teacher will take the parents to the _____.

21. A pupil may have breakfast in school. He must come at _____ A.M. so he can be fed.

22. Your child's lunch period is the _____ at _____ o'clock.

23. The lunch room is in the _____ floor.

24. The preparation of the lunch is supervised by a _____.

25. The school provides a _____ so children can stay in good health.

Part II: True or False

1. There is a doctor and a nurse in the school every day.

2. The school doctor prescribes medicines to sick children.

3. The school will give medication to sick children.

4. A sick child should come to school.

5. A child with a large cast on any part of his body should come to school.

6. A sick child can be sent home alone.

7. We may send a child home even if no one is at home.

8. A pupil must be examined by a doctor before going to high school.

9. For pupils to get good marks they must be able to see well.

10. For pupils to work well they must be able to hear well.

Appendix C: QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE THE PARENTS' ABILITY TO ASSIST THEIR CHILDREN IN THE ACQUISITION OF BASIC READING SKILLS

1. Is your child a good reader?

2. What is your child's reading level? If you don't know, see his guidance counselor.

3. Why is it important to read well and have a high reading level?

4. What is the best way to increase one's reading level?

5. How can you help your child improve his reading?

   a. Encouragement
   b. Buying books, magazines, etc.
   c. Providing the right environment

6. What resources are available in our community?

   a. Hunts Point Public Library
   b. Newspapers and magazines
   c. Television programs
      1. The Electric Company
      2. Sesame Street

7. What resources are available in the school?

   a. School library
   b. Classroom libraries
   c. Reading laboratories
   d. Multi-sensory reading room
   e. RIF program

8. Resources in the home:

   a. Comic books
   b. Letters received from relatives
   c. Letters received from the school
   d. Cans, boxes, bags, packages (groceries)
   e. Books and magazines borrowed from friends and neighbors
   f. Fills--telephone, Con Edison, etc.
   g. Dictionary

9. If a graduating student reads less than 7.2 he will get a _____ to high school.

10. If a graduating student reads over 7.2 but less than 7.7, he will receive a _____.

11. If a graduating student reads 7.7 or more he will get a _____.

12. Make sure you remind your child to spend at least 30 minutes reading every day.

13. Things you should do:

    a. Consult your child's reading teacher
    b. Visit the reading class
    c. Attend workshops in reading
    d. Set the example at home